

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

---

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

---

2-26-1975

## Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, February 26, 1975

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_senate\\_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes)



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

(1975). Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, February 26, 1975. .  
[https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_senate\\_minutes/434](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/434)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact [library-corescholar@wright.edu](mailto:library-corescholar@wright.edu).

# Wright State University

# Campus Communication

Date: February 14, 1975

To: All Faculty Members

From: J. Treacy, Chairman, Agenda Committee

Subject: Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, February 26, 1975;  
3:10 P.M., Fawcett Auditorium (Room 101)

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of Fall Quarter Faculty Meeting, November 12, 1974.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of the Provost.
- V. Report on North Central Accreditation (A. MacKinney).
- VI. Report on Academic Council Activity.
- VII. Old Business:  
  
No items.
- VIII. New Business:
  - A. Approval of Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Article III, Section 8, paragraph A., Officers and General Duties:  
  
"(A) The Chairman of the Academic Council shall be the President of the University and shall preside. The President may delegate this duty, respectively, to the Provost, to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to the Vice Chairman of the Academic Council, to the Chairman of the Steering Committee, or to another member of the Academic Council."
  - B. Presentation of Suggested Academic Calendar for 1975-1976 (see Addendum A).
- IX. Adjournment.

# GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

Winter Quarter

February 26, 1975

- I. The regular quarterly meeting of the academic year was called to order by the Vice President of the University Faculty, John Treacy, at 3:16 P.M., in Fawcett Auditorium.
- II. Minutes of the Fall Quarter Faculty Meeting, November 12, 1974, were presented for approval. Approval by voice vote was given, without correction.
- III. Report of the President, Mr. Kegerreis reporting.

A brief assessment of the present position of Wright State University and the Ohio system of universities was given by Mr. Kegerreis. The main factor considered at this time is the economic situation, with resultant effects apparent in all areas of the University community, and evidenced by recent political and legislative discussions in Columbus.

Progress, in the meantime, has continued at the University: Some new degrees have been approved - both undergraduate and graduate, some new faculty have been added, two of the new building projects are on schedule, a third building is not quite on schedule, and enrollment continues up. Enrollment for Fall was up approximately 5 - 6%, 8% for Winter, and 8 - 9% in Spring registrations, over comparable periods for last year. Although there are problems in forecasting enrollment, at least there have been no negative signs in looking forward to next Fall.

Some new programs are completing their first year; included among these is the use of Kettering Center. Implementation of programs there has been difficult, but the administration still looks forward to the downtown center becoming a bulwark in the development of the University.

Another point of pressure is the impending loss of the Aerospace Research Laboratory at the Air Force Base, closely allied with many of the faculty and programs on campus. Every effort is being made to prevent the complete loss of that institution.

A constant and continuing problem is the escalating of costs in all areas of University expenditures; Mr. Kegerreis cited one item used in the labs where the cost is now 460% higher than this time last year. Being one of the last to benefit from price controls, the University is unable to adjust prices to compensate for the cost increases and so faces an almost insurmountable problem.

In the general area of support for the development program, the acquiring of funds from non-conventional sources is not progressing as rapidly as had been hoped.

Mr. Kegerreis also mentioned the time, stress, and cost attendant upon the North Central accreditation process, but stressed as well the necessity of doing the best job possible in that area.

As a new institution, the University still has capital needs - buildings, water treatment plant, storm drainage system, exterior lighting, additional parking, etc., over and above the basic academic needs. A discussion on Monday, before the House Education Committee, indicated a complete examination of the operating budgets of the universities - questions concerned with classroom time, weekend programs, and many more, were directed to the Presidents. However, Mr. Kegerreis noted a more "sympathetic" attitude toward those in attendance, perhaps - he felt - due to the fact that the Committee itself does not have the answers on university income or their own. Mr. Kegerreis admitted that he does not feel hopeful toward the possibility of upgrading the

overall picture at the University because of the many financial stresses and uncertainties. He brought to the attention of faculty a development which furnishes basis for such feeling: The Board of Regents' budget had asked for a total of 971 million dollars in instructional subsidy structure along, yet House Bill No. 155 notes a total of 798 million dollars, a loss of more than 170 million dollars. Extended to Wright State, this means a loss of three to four million dollars. While the Regents' budget would have allowed for handling a number of problems, House Bill No. 155 allows for a straight 9% increase as opposed to the Regents' varied increases from 18 - 39% among the student expenditure models. Mr. Kegerreis expressed the feeling that the universities are receiving a rather "mechanical treatment", although, too, he felt sympathy toward the legislators attempting to cope with the many demands of unemployment benefits, special welfare programs, etc., for state support amidst the present state of uncertainty and doubt. Bringing to mind an even worse prospect than the small 9% increase over last biennium, Mr. Kegerreis told of a newspaper story featured in Columbus that same day, in which Florida legislators were asking for a significant cutback for higher education and seriously considering abolishing freshmen classes at some of their major universities. In this same vein, the Presidents were asked why they did not cut back on enrollment if they were having difficulties, and why they did not restrict classes. All of this is indicative of the uncertainty of the outcome of budgetary consideration, with yet in the offing the receipt of the executive budget from Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Kegerreis closed with the regret that his report had been of such sober nature, but held out the encouragement that the University is still growing and still has more flexibility than most universities, and therefore has more chance to focus on the best objectives rather than those simply of cost and budget.

#### IV. Report of the Provost, Mr. Spiegel reporting.

Although an educator, Mr. Spiegel admitted his role at this time of year is one of budget officer, and not an appealing role when one is trying to put together a budget without even knowing what the income will be. Continuing Mr. Kegerreis' thoughts, he pointed out that with Mr. Rhodes' budget yet to be considered, budget hearings throughout the state yet to be held, and final approval with attendant debate, it would be quite some time before the University actually knows where it stands with regard to income. Last biennium, the information was not forthcoming from Columbus until November, and Mr. Spiegel held out no hope that it would be sooner this time. In spite of costs over which the administration has no control, such as heating expenditures (resulting in lowered thermostats and uncomfortable working conditions), Mr. Spiegel stated the salary increase of 9% will stay. Beyond that, Mr. Spiegel assured all that it would be necessary for him to examine very carefully every budgetary request - whether for new positions or otherwise, the service areas will have less, and there would be times when everyone will feel the inability of the services to act as quickly as they might with additional personnel. A note of humor was introduced with Mr. Spiegel's denial that a search for a basketball coach carried an unlimited ceiling on salary. Returning to more serious thoughts, Mr. Spiegel mentioned the difficulty in setting Library acquisition funds, but assured the faculty they would do the very best they could under present stresses.

Mr. Kegerreis is scheduled for a student meeting on March 5th, in the Allyn Hall Student Lounge, and Mr. Spiegel urged all faculty to make an effort to attend. He expressed his feeling that they would find the variety of questions of interest, and in the main related to them.

After cautioning faculty that he could not tell them much definitely concerning parking plans under consideration, Mr. Spiegel opened the floor to questions from those present.

Interchange between Mr. Spiegel and Mr. Sachs brought out that the design of some doors on campus seems not to hold up well, and that it is difficult to enter a building when the door has been boarded up because of broken glass. Mr. Spiegel pointed out that repair on shorter order would not be possible with the cutting of service area hiring for new positions, but he urged the report of such problems to himself or to the Physical Plant. The assumption that someone else has reported a problem often leaves it unreported.

A request was received by Mr. Spiegel for comment on the status of the disability plan for the first five years of employment, and Mr. Spiegel agreed with Mr. Murray that this was an item that will have to wait for consideration at the time the budgets are all in and the amount of income is known. It was pointed out by Mr. Pabst that in recruiting new faculty the University is at a disadvantage without a disability plan for new faculty. Further information is to be brought out at a later time, and the larger the income, the more items will be covered or included.

Other brief discussions included tentative plans for spring care of pathways to the parking lots, the possibility of converting some squash courts to handball courts or adding handball courts if funding permits, and then points were brought out in relation to Library acquisitions. Although a slight increase in funding was made last year, the money brought to the Library 25% less in purchases - indicating clearly the tremendous increase in costs. Mr. Murray presented the figure of \$437,000 budgeted last year, and a tentative \$550,000 this year, but cautioned that again the increased monies will undoubtedly purchase no more than the lower figure of last year. Mr. Spiegel alerted all to the fact that this figure of \$550,000 could be cut at a later time, due to the requirement by law of having a "balanced" budget, and expressed his regret that the state will not grant specific capital requests for library acquisitions. Mr. Kegerreis elaborated: The coming two years will be the first period the University will be without a special grant for the development of a new campus; monies for the Library must be drawn from the regular budget rather than special sources. Mr. Murray indicated that of the \$437,000 last year, \$175,000 was from a special grant of money.

The question was posed concerning the publicized federal and state urban development plans and whether any part of these funds would be channeled to the universities. It was brought out by both Mr. Kegerreis and Mr. Treacy that these plans appeared to apply only to institutions located in "inner city" areas and that if a university were located within a city, it might well profit from the funds. In response to a question whether this might apply to Kettering Center, Mr. Spiegel stated that might be a possibility.

Referring back to a mention of the development committee, the question was asked if progress was being made toward acquiring external funds; Mr. Kegerreis replied that this project was proceeding much more slowly than had been anticipated, undoubtedly due to the fact that those external sources (persons making gifts, grants, wills, etc.) are under added pressure from all sides due to the economic situation in general.

Mr. Battino questioned progress in the "key" situation and Mr. Spiegel admitted that though a "Safety Office" and "Safety Officer" had been included in last year's and this year's budgets, it was an item that had had to be cut as less pressing than some other needs. He stated the responsibility for safety now rests with Dr. Conley, that he would get in touch with Dr. Conley, and that Mr. Battino should check further with him (Mr. Spiegel).

Related to cutting costs, the suggestion was made and accepted by Mr. Spiegel to look into the



various campus mailings made to staff and faculty - on campus and to the individual homes.

V. Report on North Central Accreditation, Mr. MacKinney reporting.

Mr. MacKinney stated the self-study portion of the accreditation is virtually completed, noting that between forty and fifty faculty members were involved in the departmental self-study project late last summer and in the fall. He noted that the document on the university level is not a compilation of those departmental reports but is an original document based on those. Final review of that university-level self-study is scheduled for next week, allowing about a month for delivery of the final product to Chicago. Copies of this near-final draft will be in each College office so that any faculty member may look at it, it being a public document. Input at this point in time is solicited, would be welcome in the preparation of the final draft.

Mr. MacKinney acknowledged with thanks the special assistance given by Pete Bracher in the drawing-off of all pertinent information from the sometimes quite extensive departmental self-studies; his special talent in describing important aspects of the various programs has been most helpful.

The self-study is to be supplemented by four substantial institutional research projects. These include institutional goals, student goals, an attritional study tracing graduate students for the past three years, and a faculty attitudes study. At the time of delivery of the final self-study data, plans for the balance of the activities leading to the final decision will be laid.

The site visit will be next fall, including from seven to nine people, for a week - perhaps in October and certainly before Thanksgiving. Following that will be the review process, carried out by an independent committee. . . . this is all part of the three-step review used by North Central. The independent review committee will review the report of the site team, and all data will be sent to the Higher Education Commission in the spring of 1976. This comprises a brief outline of expected activities for about the next coming twelve months.

The normal review cycle for North Central is each ten years, but following this initial review Mr. MacKinney has been advised by the North Central staff that a five-year span will be about the best to be expected, for the following two reasons: The implementation of the medical school and the program for doctoral development will necessitate a review, and review for W.O.B.C. is in three years. This means that accreditation review will happen frequently within the next ten years.

Mr. MacKinney concluded his report with an expression of his indebtedness to all the faculty participating in the preparations for review, stating he felt truth to be in the statement that "we have never known so much about ourselves" before, primarily due to the extensive involvement of all.

VI. Report on Academic Council activity, Mr. Treacy reporting.

Discussing progress made on the Revised Promotions and Tenure Document now under consideration by Academic Council, Mr. Treacy alerted faculty to a number of changes being made and indicated the document would be placed on the agenda for the May 10th Spring Faculty Meeting.

Announcement was made by Mr. Treacy of the coming Teaching Effectiveness Seminars, the first to be held in April and the second in May. Further details will be channeled to the faculty

by the ad hoc Committee on Effective Teaching.

Problems have been encountered in relation to the faculty dining room, which at this time is running at an approximate \$100-110 weekly deficit. Mr. Treacy indicated his objection to the project being subsidized in any way, suggesting the possibility of improved patronage or an annual membership charge to deal with the cost of using the facility.

Mr. Treacy has been the recipient of faculty complaints with regard to parking, which problem has worsened in the Winter Quarter - in contrast to an expected alleviation during that time. Since only a specific number of parking spaces are available, the Steering Committee will continue to seek a solution to some of the difficulties.

VII. There were no items of Old Business.

VIII. New Business:

A. Approval of Amendment to the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Article III, Section 8, paragraph A., Officers and General Duties:

"(A) The Chairman of the Academic Council shall be the President of the University and shall preside. The President may delegate this duty, respectively, to the Provost, to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to the Vice Chairman of the Academic Council, to the Chairman of the Steering Committee, or to another member of the Academic Council."

The amendment was placed as a motion, seconded, and will be acted upon as Old Business at the Spring Faculty Meeting. (A quorum of thirty-five percent of the faculty needs to be present to conduct business.)

B. Presentation of Suggested Academic Calendar for 1975-76 (Addendum A to the Agenda).

Mr. Treacy introduced discussion of the proposed calendar with the comment that it reflected a response to the desire on the part of students for a break between Winter and Spring quarters, a desire shared by some of the faculty. He further mentioned that this calendar was built by the ad hoc Calendar Committee, chaired by Dr. Chao.

Mr. Treacy pointed out, in response to the question of whether the faculty was to act on the proposed calendar, that Academic Council would act on it but that this occasion was an opportunity for faculty input in relation to the calendar.

Mr. Fritz affirmed, from the faculty body, advisability of this move. Some of the problems encountered in Academic Council consideration of a calendar last year would make this seem the proper approach for obtaining faculty input. He further stated he could see no problem in getting out a bit later in June, so long as the students desired the spring break, recognizing that a later dismissal in June would occur.

Mr. Treacy reiterated that student surveys indicated a ratio of about 80/20% in favor of the break between Winter and Spring.

Mr. Seiger pointed out the need some faculty have for early dismissal in order to accomplish field work, but admitted that even a May dismissal might be too late....but suggesting an earlier start in September.

Problems then brought out included the difficulty in beginning a Winter Quarter before Christmas, the need to include a specifically required number of teaching days/hours for state approval, the delay in students getting jobs with a later dismissal, conflicting schedules with other schools and with students drawn from the public school systems, the furor caused on the Ohio State campus by the decision to go to an early semester with the resultant gap in the academic year (encompassing the month of December), and the assurance by D.P. & L. that estimates at this time indicate fuel will be available next year in approximately the amounts now on tap. In this latter vein, Mr. Kegerreis pointed out that the conserving of fuel by the early semester was a theoretical one. Mr. Chao brought out that the committee had discussed other ways and means of conserving fuel rather than an adjustment of calendar.

Going astray momentarily from the calendar discussion, a query was placed as to consideration of the semester system as opposed to the quarter system; Mr. Treacy replied that the possibility was under study by several committees on campus.

IX. There being no further items for consideration, the meeting was adjourned at 4:22 P.M.